

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/835,620	TAKASHIMIZU, YOSHIHIRO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lucas Divine	2624

All Participants:

(1) Lucas Divine.

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____.

(2) Randy Beckers.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 9 December 2005
Time: 2:00pm
Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: *Email submitted by Mr. Beckers pursuant to discussion of item 1 as discussed in the comments below. Email is attached hereto as part of OFFICIAL RECORD.*

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

1) §112(2) rejections of claims 7 and 8 regarding the use of the word substantially;
2) Objections to title, to dot/pixel language, and to clarity of pixel dot size language.

Claims discussed:

3 and 7 (and thus claims with the same language)

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet


Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: 1) Examiner explained: the MPEP § 2173.05(b) states that when the claim language is using such relative terminology that 'Acceptability of the claim language depends on whether one of ordinary skill in the art would understand what is claimed, in light of the specification.' Further, later in the same section the MPEP discusses 'some standard for measuring that degree' and 'adequacy of the disclosure' and 'held to be indefinite because the specification lacked some standard for measuring' and 'it was not clear from the specification'. And in item D of the section, the Board only upheld substantially as definite when the word is definite in view of information in the specification.

Applicant thus submitted remarks showing in the specification the basic guidelines to one of ordinary skill in the art for determining what a substantially vertical or horizontal line irregularity would be. (see attached remarks by applicant).

2) Applicant agreed with changes to the wordings of the claims to make them more clear and overcome the objections as well as to the new title suggestion from Examiner - see Examiner Amendment with Notice of Allowability for amendments.